

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated February 21, 2006 has been reviewed, and the comments of the U.S. Patent Office have been considered. Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-5, 8, and 11 have been amended. The amendments to independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 11 are supported in the originally-filed specification by, at least, paragraphs [0477], [0494], and [0544]. Claim 4 has been amended to correspond with claim 6, and claims 2-4 have been amended for consistency with claim 1.

The amendments to the specification update paragraph [0001] with patent numbers corresponding to the listed patent applications. Also, some of the applications identified in paragraph [0001] are no longer commonly assigned to the assignee of the above-identified application. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Shimizu (JP Patent No. 2002186120 A) (a computer-generated English-language translation of Shimizu is attached hereto). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Shimizu fails to show or describe an electric car or vehicle, or a method of propelling a car or vehicle, involving at least one motor and/or generator comprising two or more electromagnetic power circuits that provide power to the motor and/or generator, the circuits having no electrical connection to each other (per claim 1) or being sufficiently isolated to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits (per claims 5, 8 and 11). Shimizu at Fig. 3 and paragraph [0039] shows that the Shimizu vehicle has eight motors (motors 30-37) but Shimizu otherwise fails to show or describe whether at least one of those motors has two or more electromagnetic power circuits because the interior composition of each motor is not shown or described. Fig. 3 shows only a box representative of each motor, without providing any details as to whether any motor comprises two or more electromagnetic power circuits.

The Office Action at page 3 appears to interpret Shimizu's motors 30-37 to have two or more electromagnetic circuits because of the wiring externally connecting inverters 10, 10', 11, 11', 12, 12', 13, and 13' to motors 30-37, respectively. However, as shown in Fig. 3, each motor is connected to only a single inverter. Shimizu thus fails to show or describe two or more electromagnetic power circuits that provide power to a motor.

Furthermore, Shimizu's inverters are electrically connected to each other and are thus not circuits that are isolated or designed to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits. As shown in Fig. 3, each line (drawn as a double line) extending from the battery-side of each inverter connects at common nodes. *See, e.g.*, the node in Fig. 3 just to the bottom right of inverter 10'. Shimizu's inverters also connect to each other at node N10. *See* paragraph [0079]. Thus, each inverter is shown and described as sharing a common electrical connection with at least another inverter. Shimizu at paragraph [0041] confirms that the common electrical connection is utilized for the inverter where it describes that the power supplied by common battery 6 is connected to motors 30-37 and inverters 10', 11, 11', 12, 12', 13, and 13'. Shimizu thus fails to show or describe electromagnetic power circuits that provide power and that have no electrical connection to each other. Shimizu also thus fails to show or describe electromagnetic power circuits that provide power and that are sufficiently isolated to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits.

At pages 4-5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that the claims do not clearly recite that the recited electromagnetic circuits are power circuits. To advance prosecution, independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 11 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim these features. As asserted previously in the November 10, 2005 Amendment, Shimizu does not show or describe two or more power circuits.

For the foregoing reasons, Shimizu fails to show or describe all of the features recited in the independent claims or in the dependent claims thereof. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

According to page 3 of the May 10, 2005 Office Action, claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 on alleged double patenting grounds over claim 1 of co-pending application No. 10/809,808. This provisional rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 of the above-identified application has been amended since the rejection was asserted, and claim 1 of the above-identified application is not coextensive in scope with claim 1 of co-pending application No. 10/809,808. Accordingly, consistent with MPEP §804.02, it is respectfully requested that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Application and the prompt allowance of pending claims 1-11.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3840. **This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).**

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Laub
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 38,708

Date: October 30, 2006
Patent Administrator
Proskauer Rose LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202.416.6800
Facsimile: 202.416.6899
CUSTOMER NO: 61263

Customer No. 61263

Enclosure: Computer-generated English-language translation of JP Patent No. 2002186120 A